

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11 and 12 have been amended and claims 13-27 have been added as a result of this Response. Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 13, 19 and 25-27 are independent claims.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has objected to the Specification due to minor informalities. Applicants propose the enclosed amendments in order to place the application in better form for U.S. Practice. With respect to "DPE" Applicants respectfully submit that this acronym stands for "Development, Print, and Enlargement" which is a Japanese term which is synonymous with a minilab shop or a wholesale laboratory. Applicants have amended the specification to define this acronym

CLAIM OBJECTION

The Examiner has objected to claim 8 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. Applicants have amended claim 8 such that it depends from claim 6 instead of claim 1, thereby removing this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 3, 8 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph due to minor informalities. Applicants have addressed these minor informalities in the enclosed amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Moghadam - Cameron Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moghadam in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,378 to Cameron. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to a picture print ordering method and system as illustrated in Figure 1. In Figure 1, a recording medium 2 is utilized for the exchange of data between the laboratory system 9 and the user located at PC 7. The recording medium 2 permits high resolution picture image data to be provided by the laboratory system 9 to the user at the PC 7. The user may then freely edit the high resolution image data at his home PC utilizing the image data recorded on the recording medium 2 and the print order can be produced based on the results of the user's edit.

Figure 4 illustrates the basic system of Moghadam. In particular, as illustrated in Figure 4, an index file 84 (illustrated in Figure 5) is provided via communication channel 72 from the photofinish center 50 to the user 66.

There are numerous differences between the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12. In particular, in the present invention, high resolution picture image data is transferred from the lab system 9 to the user PC 7, whereas in contrast, Moghadam only transmits index files 84 via communication channel 72, and not the entire high resolution image picture. As a result, the user 66 in Moghadam is not able to perform a wide variety of editing functions which can influence his print order. The Moghadam customer can only order print information utilizing the image stored at the laboratory. While Moghadam receives the index information 84 quickly via communication channel 72, the Moghadam user 66 does not receive the entire high resolution picture image, and therefore is limited in the editing process to be undertaken. Therefore, the Moghadam user 66 is only able to select images from the photofinishing center 50. He is not able to edit and select his own edited images, as in the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cameron fails to make up for the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Moghadam. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending dependent claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims 1 and 6 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Applicants have also added new claims 13-27 which are directed to various other patentable aspects of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also distinguishable over Moghadam and Cameron.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Moghadam - Cameron - PC OnLine Rejection

Claims 2, 5, 7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moghadam, Cameron, and further in view of PC Magazine OnLine. Applicants respectfully submit that the PC Magazine OnLine prior art fails to make up for the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Moghadam and Cameron. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 5, 7 and 10 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims 1 or 6, for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the various objections and rejections and allowance of claims 1-27 of the present application is respectfully requested.

The amendments presented in the response are for the purpose of placing the application in better form for U.S. practice with the exception of the amended feature emphasized above in the traversal of the art rejections.

In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact John A. Castellano at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area, to discuss this application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.36(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing an Amendment in the present application. Please charge the required fee of **\$110.00** to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for a one (1) month extension of time to March 12, 1999.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP

By: 

John A. Castellano
Registration No. 35,094

JAC:sje:mdp:ljr

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000